

# The Virgin Birth of Yeshua/Jesus in Scripture and Myth.

BY SHA'UL BAYN YAHUKHENUN HA YAHUDAH



## The Way of the Most High

"Exalting belief in our Father, the Most High  $\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  (YaHUAH), through His Turah, the 5 scrolls of M'shah" (Moses - Gen. to Deut.).

Internet Site – [www.thewayofthemosthigh.ca](http://www.thewayofthemosthigh.ca)

Email – [followyah@gmail.com](mailto:followyah@gmail.com)

This article is the result of a debate that occurred on YouTube live between myself and pastor Matthew Janzen of *Ministers New Covenant*, hosted by Sean Griffin of *Kingdom in Context* YouTube channel. Video link is [https://youtu.be/iYSRTUX\\_TmM](https://youtu.be/iYSRTUX_TmM). This is a more articulate and thorough explanation of the concepts which the New Testament writers took out of context to form their new belief system contradictory to the Turah (Gen. to Deut.). I am even going to include invalid arguments that people on my side against the New Testament have improperly argued. Lastly this article addresses the "virgin birth" concept derived from heathen/pagan myths prior to the New Testament. I'll even straighten out false concepts like "Nimrod, Semiramus and Tammuz" which was never historically a Trinity of B'bayl (Babylon). **It is my prayer most of all that this article will help people to return to YaHUAH and the Turah as prophesied in D'bayrim (Deut.) 30.**

In my endeavours to become a pastor for the Seventh day Adventist Church just before my marriage I did a few years of university learning lots about ancient religions, theology, philosophy, Aibreet (Hebrew) and Greek. As a result of studying parallels between Christianity and paganism/heathenism, and as a result of learning the original languages of Scripture I was eventually led to understand that the New Testament is against Genesis to Deuteronomy otherwise known as the Turah. This led me to follow **אֱלֹהֵינוּ** (YaHUAH) our Creator alone, and the Turah alone as remains our passion and belief system at present. D'bayrim (Deut.) 4:2 and 12:32 for example say "**You will not (la) add (tas'pu) to the Word (ayl ha-Dabayr) which (asher) even I (An'ki) command (m'tsuah) you (at'kam),** and you will not (uah-la) take away (t'grai'u) from it (m'menu), that you may guard (l'sh'mer) at the commandments (at mets'oot) of **אֱלֹהֵינוּ** (YaHUAH) your Mighty One (Alahaykam)." This has always been the belief of the Sh'merunim or Samaritans, and similarly the Falashas. For more see my website the Way of the Most High.ca or Facebook. I sympathize with people like Matthew Janzen because for a number of years I also attempted to reconcile contradictions that we will speak about in this article. In our modern age there are tons of information available through university libraries, commentary and study versions of the "Bible," professors and the internet. With that, the falsehood of the virgin birth has been plainly seen by numerous people. On one hand it has led to a growing trend of people who still somehow cling to the New Testament because they can't let it go, but who deny that Yeshua/Jesus was born of a virgin. To do so is to deny the New Testament text of course, but they try. Numerous books now speak of Yeshua/Jesus as simply a regular guy who taught parables. And why not? M'shiah (Moses) was a regular guy who led the people out of bondage and slaves to a land of promise and wealth in the presence of the Most High and His Tabernacle. All of the characters prior to the New Testament were simply regular people. **The "seed of Y'shr'Al (Israel)" or "sons of Y'shr'Al" (Israel) is what is spoken of from the beginning (Genesis 48:11). Y'shr'Al (Israel) had never been looking for a "virgin birth" prior to the New Testament writings.** But for Christianity, why did Yeshua/Jesus HAVE to be born of a virgin? Because if he was just a regular guy then he wouldn't be the Son of Alahym or **אֱלֹהֵינוּ** (YaHUAH) commonly "God." He'd just be some guy from the seed of Yusap (Joseph). **You won't find anywhere in the New Testament that Yeshua/Jesus acknowledges his father Yusap (Joseph) or is addressed as the "Son of Yusap (Joseph)" excepting when people are criticising him as in Luke 4:22.** He is instead always idolized as the Son of Alahym (God), and understandably so. If He was tied to the sperm or seed of Yusap

(Joseph) then he wouldn't be the pre-existent Son who sat at the right hand of the Father since the beginning, and through whom the Father made all things through. Again, the whole point of the New Testament is the idea that the Creator, the Father, had a pre-existent Son who was by Him the whole time, whom He sent to be a perfect offering for transgressions because all of us regular guys are not perfect enough. A "second" and more perfect Adawm (1 Cor. 15:45). But is this concept Scriptural and historical?

On the historical end of things, people have to realize that the development of the New Testament took well over 100 years from the death of Yeshua/Jesus. A handful of about 50 fragmented pieces date to 50CE thereabouts or later. The rest are from 130CE onward. John Rylands Manuscript - 130CE. Bodmer Papyrus II - 150-200CE. Diatessaron - 170CE. Chester Beatty Papyri - 200CE. Codex Alexandrinus - 400CE. Codex Bezae Canabrigiensis - 450CE. Codex Vaticanus - 325-350CE. Codex Sinaiticus - 350CE. Dates vary according to sources but these are the general facts of consensus. Keep that in mind as we proceed. This being the case, it helps readers to understand that the historical Yeshua/Jesus, which I have no doubt there must have been, is not the same as the character the New Testament made him to be after over 100 years of written development and idolization. Concepts such as the virgin birth, the resurrection and numerous "miracles" no doubt fall into the category of late myth development. I hope that doesn't cause readers to stop reading here, because we are going to look at all of the quotations that New Testament writers made claiming that Yeshua/Jesus was foretold in the Turah or TaNaK (OT).

Prior to the debate with Matthew Janzen I noticed a number of Facebook posts he had made. On 5/26/19 he posted that "Adam was Yahweh's Son, directly created by the breath of the Almighty to supply life. Adam imaged his Creator. Image bearing sonship, not from descent. He had no biological parents, yet was fully human." First of all there is no parallel or comparison between Yeshua/Jesus and Adawm, although numerous passages in Paul's writings claim that Yeshua/Jesus was a "second" Adawm. Adawm was created as a full and complete adult male, and was created from the ground. Yeshua/Jesus supposedly was created in the womb of Mer'yam (Mary), who was already in the lineage of people after the fall, impure. Philippians 2:5-11 claims he was sent from heaven to become flesh. Wouldn't it make much more sense to create a second Adawm from the ground that would actually be perfect, untainted by the lineage of the first Adawm, and one that was obedient to the Turah, never transgressing? And I know that people claim Yeshua/Jesus never transgressed but we'll get to that later. The New Testament unequivocally makes the claim that Yeshua/Jesus existed prior to coming in the flesh as some literal Son at the right hand of the Father, through whom the Father made all things in the beginning. The only place in Scripture that Adawm and his descendants are likened to a "son" is in metaphorical terms such as Sh'moot (Ex.) 4:2 where YaH calls His son Y'shr'Al (Israel) out of M'tsrayim (Egypt). The word there is for His "firstborn" or "b'koor." **Sadly there is never any mention of some "Son" up in heaven at the right hand of the Father in any writing prior the New Testament.**

Janzen stated in another post that miracles are "Unexplainable to the human mind. You don't try to explain miracles. You just believe them." The problem is, **the "miracles" of the Turah are explainable through the history and archaeology that recorded them.** It is my belief and understanding that the creation account of Genesis and events such as the great earthquake of Pay'lag (Peleg – B'rasheet – Gen. 10:25), the great flood of Nuakh (Noah),

destruction of Sadowm and Aym'rah (Sodom and Gomorrah), and also the Exodus are evidenced in hard reality of archaeology and history. See references or source information in my book, *The Path of the Most High* or some of my website articles. The fact is that there are mounds of information and archaeology now available pertaining to Egypt, Assyria, Mesopotamia and etcetera. We uncover much of their way of life and worship, or how their kings, rulers and pharaohs were exalted through myth and legend, along with their wives and their children. It is seen in hieroglyphs, paintings, stone tablets, obelisks and more. These depictions, engravings and writings all point to common themes of SUN worship (S-U-N), female womb/fertility worship, and daughter/son worship. The problem is that **in ancient times people knew that pharaohs died, that miraculous birth stories were myths**, and that all of these matters were simply cultural worship. But for New Testament believers, the virgin birth is an essential element of their beliefs and is taken to be an actual real fact. Not just a myth or legend. It is in fact the foundation of belief in the "God-man" who grew to become a perfect offering for transgressions. Somehow he is thought not to be defiled by any regular man's sperm, not a regular person and therefore better than your average Joe. Being better than us, he is therefore thought of as the atonement for transgressions and means to everlasting life and/or resurrection. Yet **there is nowhere in Scriptures prior to the New Testament that speaks of a "virgin" prophesied to give birth to the Anointed One** (m'shiyawkh-Messiah). We'll deal with Matthew 1:23 in this regard later, as that is the only place that makes such a claim.

Now before we get into the virgin birth concept, I want to address the idea of the pre-existence of Yeshua/Jesus. For a number of years I tried to reconcile the New Testament problem of the Trinity. The Trinity or Dualist belief of Father and Son was, is, and always will be a problem contradictory to the Turah (Gen. to Deut.). This belief was eventually solidified in the latter portion of the first century of our Common Era (CE) through statements like Philippians 2:5-11. Paul specifically and literally states that Yeshua/Jesus accepted to be made lower than the messengers (angels), took on the form of a servant and the likeness of Adawm (man), obedient unto death, and therefore exalted above all people and messengers (angels). The only reason someone would deny the pre-existence of the Son is because there is no mention of this Son anywhere in Scripture prior to the New Testament. Matthew Janzen stated that pagan/heathen myths prior to Yeshua/Jesus never had the idea of a person coming down from above into the womb of a lady. He stated that every myth prior to the virgin birth of Yeshua/Jesus involved sexuality. I know that some people may have fallen for this but it isn't true. According to the story of Krishna for example, he descended into the womb of Devaki, to bear the child Vaasudeva. I'll share references and further details of heathen/pagan myths later. For now it was important to say that the idea of the pre-existence of Yeshua/Jesus is inextricably connected to the concept of the virgin birth, and of Yeshua/Jesus coming down, into a womb, to be an offering for transgressions.

If YaH wanted to create a second and more perfect Adawm without transgression as a perfect offering for people's transgressions, why did He not do so again from the ground? Why taint this perfect creation by placing him in the womb of Mer'yam (Mary)? And why bother with Yusap (Joseph) in the story at all since his sperma (Greek), za'rai (Aibreet) or seed has nothing to do with Yeshua/Jesus anyhow? In the sermons Matthew Janzen preaches, he clearly shows he understands Yeshua/Jesus wasn't conceived of

sperm, but some miracle which Janzen admits and tries to liken to Abraham and Sarah (Sarah). Not at all the same. We have seen in our own news media in our modern age that there are people in their 60s who still conceive and bear a child. The environment and lifespan of people like Abraham was better than it is today. So although it may be looked upon as a miracle, it is still a natural process. Abraham and Sarah (Sarah) are not at all comparable to the myth of Yeshua/Jesus' birth. Abraham and Sarah (Sarah) had sexual relations which the Most High favoured. Sarah (Sarah) was well past the state of being a virgin at that time. People were expecting a Deliverer to come through the "seed" or descendants of the tribes of Y'shr'Al (Israel). This was never interpreted metaphorically. The idea of a Deliverer who would come from a virgin birth apart from a natural conception through sexuality and lineage to the tribes of Y'shr'Al (Israel) is simply non-existent prior to the New Testament.

**We need only to ask a few questions:**

1. Are the "gospel" writers trustworthy to verifiable historical facts?
2. Are quotations from Scriptures prior to the New Testament accurate to the original historical context and meaning?
3. Are New Testament statements and concepts contradictory to Scriptures that were written before the New Testament?

I will begin by saying that people do not have to have "faith" without evidence regarding Yah and the Torah. **The Torah is based on real facts that speak about our very real Creator. It speaks of His involvement and Government of His people, and of prophetic events that we can trust. Trust based upon the verification of past fulfillments such as the Exodus.** ***Christianity on the other hand***, without having evidence of significant, HUGE claims that SHOULD be in history and archaeology, ***asks us to have blind belief or "faith"*** in matters such as our current subject of the "virgin birth." אֱלֹהֵינוּ (YaHUAH) our Creator had ample opportunity from Adam down to M'shih (Moses), in giving His people the words of the Torah, Genesis to Deuteronomy, or even the rest of the TaNaKh (commonly called Old Testament) to speak very clearly that He had a Son at His right hand through whom He laid the foundations of the lands, seas, mountains, stars and etcetera as claimed in texts like Ephesians 3:9; Col. 1:16; Heb. 1:2; 2:8-10; and Philippians 2:5-11. אֱלֹהֵינוּ (YaHUAH) could have told His people in no uncertain mystery that He had a Son at His right hand, and was going to send this Son through a virgin birth, to grow into a mature adult for a pure burnt offering on Day of Atonement to once and for all cleanse and end the transgressions of all people. He could have stated very clearly that after this supposed Son dies, that we will have to wait over 2000 years for this Son to actually exercise any form of kingly power in the overthrow of all the kingdoms and governments, the destruction of the enemies of Y'shr'Al (Israel), the gathering of the lost tribes of Y'shr'Al (Israel) that were dispersed amongst the nations, and the establishment of an everlasting kingdom of peace.

**Deuteronomy 17:6 states that at least two witnesses for verification are necessary especially in matters of judgment pertaining to life and death.** Would it not be even more necessary when the New Testament claims that Yeshua/Jesus is the only way to the Father (John 14:6) and the only way to have everlasting life (John 3:16,36)? Matthew and Luke are the only writers to talk about the young Yeshua/Jesus. Some differences between Matthew and Luke are not detrimental to Christian fundamental

beliefs. Other differences are important enough to cause reasonable doubt that Matthew and Luke genuinely recorded historical and truthful facts about Yeshua/Jesus. Before we get to the differences in their accounts and all of the problematic quotations out of context from the TaNaKh (OT), I would like to focus on the plain and simple points of how the "virgin" birth is contradictory to marital laws of the Turah (Gen. to Deut.).

In sermon number 242 of Matthew Janzen's website, pastor Matthew said "Don't think in the carnal. Don't use your carnal mind, Yahweh did not violate Mary's virginity."<sup>1</sup> "Yahweh didn't TAKE Joseph's betrothed wife. There's nothing sexual going on here in this text."<sup>2</sup> Well I'm not sure exactly what kind of scholarly debates Janzen has been listening to but I don't believe anyone in my position arguing against the virgin birth is claiming that YaH had some form of sexual interaction with Mer'yam (Mary). There are however numerous valid arguments against why such a thing would be against the Turah and a violation of the marital rights of Yusap (Joseph) and Mer'yam (Mary). Mer'yam (Mary) and Yusap (Joseph) were **robbed of having a traditional consummation** of the marriage. They were **robbed of having an actual wedding ceremony** in which the father of the bride, in the presence of the priesthood and elders of the city would rejoice in the union of marriage. It's also interesting to note that none of the "Gospel" writers spoke about a marriage ceremony taking place for them, not even after the birth. Yet these same writers spoke of numerous weddings and parables of such. The betrothed couple was also **robbed of the intimate joys of intercourse during the 9 months of pregnancy** as Matthew states in 1:25 that Yusap (Joseph) "knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son." Why? would that have tainted the "God-man?"

Mer'yam (Mary) would also be **robbed of her insurance or matrimonial cloth**. They called this the virginity cloth. Any time that a lady would get married according to ancient Aibree (Hebrew) rights, the cloth upon which the blood of virginity went upon consummation was proof of virginity and marriage. The husband could not accuse the family or the lady of being given a bad deal. It was important. I know it's not import in today's relationships. Giving the father of the bride a bridal dowry, as well as the evidence of virginity cloth, as well as giving of the bride by the father to the son in law and consummation of the marriage were all a very big deal. Oftentimes a man would not meet his partner until the day of the wedding. So how would a broken or false agreement be dealt with? What if a person was believing his "bride to be" was a virgin but in fact was not? A man was required to pay the father of the bride a substantial amount of money for marriage. He'd have no way of knowing anything prior to the day of the wedding. Janzen, aware of this fact even referenced 2 Sh'mu'Al (Sam.) 13:18. There is an example of a special garment that Ta'mer (commonly Tamar) wore, which she tore after being raped by Ab'sh'loom (Absalom). Matthew and Luke both mention betrothal, virginity, and that there was no consummation until the birth of Yeshua/Jesus. But neither of them speak about the proof of virginity or the facts that I have mentioned.

"If any man takes a wife, and goes in to her, and detests her, and charges her with shameful conduct, and brings a bad name on her, and says, 'I took this woman, and when I came to her I found she was not a virgin,' then the father and mother of the young woman shall take and bring out the evidence of the young woman's virginity to the elders of the city at the gate. And the young woman's father shall say to the elders, 'I gave my

---

<sup>1</sup> 53:37 mark.

<sup>2</sup> 54 minute mark.

daughter to this man as wife, and he detests her. 'Now he has charged her with shameful conduct, saying, "I found your daughter was not a virgin," and yet these are the evidences of my daughter's virginity.' And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city. Then the elders of that city shall take that man and punish him; and they shall fine him one hundred shekels of silver and give them to the father of the young woman, because he has brought a bad name on a virgin of Israel. And she shall be his wife; he cannot divorce her all his days. But if the thing is true, and evidences of virginity are not found for the young woman, then they shall bring out the young woman to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her to death with stones, because she has done a disgraceful thing in Israel, to play the harlot in her father's house. So you shall put away the evil from among you" (Deuteronomy 22:13-21). For now it is enough to state that a virgin having an "Immaculate conception" is a violation of the marital rights of Yusap (Joseph) and Mer'yam (Mary), and the cloth of virginity was never produced. As far as everyone else was concerned, historically speaking, Yeshua/Jesus was the son of a regular birth and/or fornication. The proper thing to do for Yusap (Joe) would be to go to the parents of Mer'yam (Mary) and for them to present the special garments and/or cloth of virginity and present it before the elders. After all, it is claimed by Matthew that Mary was "found" out to be pregnant somehow, and Joe was gonna divorce her. Upon the actual birth of Yeshua/Jesus the confirmation of virginity and the miracle birth of the Son of **יְהוָה** (YaHUAH) could have been confirmed and proclaimed by such a cloth of virginity. Yeshua/Jesus was accused of being a "son of fornication" according to John 8:41. Some translations like the NIV accurately read "we are not illegitimate children." The Greek word used is "porneia," the same word we get "pornography" from, meaning harlotry or fornication (Strong's G#4202). In later centuries there were more than a few writings which claimed that Yeshua/Jesus was the son of rape by a soldier by the name of Pantera or that the true father of Yeshua/Jesus was not known. To me it matters not that such claims exist and the claims are made rather loosely. I only bring it up to say that it wasn't just a small thing that a couple people questioned the birth of Yeshua/Jesus.

Most New Testament commentators try to circumvent John 8:41 and explain it away as unimportant or that the translation was messed up. If we read John 8:37-57, we see several things in this conversation between Yahudim (those who worship YaH), and Yeshua/Jesus. Yeshua/Jesus keeps attempting to say that the Yahudim (Jews) are of the "devil" and that he is from the heavenly Father. Yeshua/Jesus attempts to drag people away from the topic of who he is actually the son of in terms of earthly lineage. He doesn't bother with the genealogies that Matthew and Luke wrote about. He doesn't refer to his parents or make grand claims to the kingly Davidic lineage. He doesn't even mention the miraculous birth he came from. It is clearly seen in verses 39, 41, 53 and 57 that the Yahudim (Jews) are the descendants of Abraham, that they follow YaH and the Turah and not Yeshua/Jesus as some Son of YaH outside of the lineage of Abraham. They hint that Yeshua/Jesus is an illegitimate child. Yeshua/Jesus concludes in verse 58 that he existed prior to Abraham, which the Yahudim (Jews) clearly understood to be blasphemy deserving of stoning as seen in verse 59. As usual Yeshua/Jesus runs away and hides (verse 59 again). There's simply no fudging around the fact that Yahudim (Jews) knew the parents of Yeshua/Jesus and thought him to be from an illegitimate relationship, whereas Yeshua/Jesus was circumventing his earthly parents and claiming to exist as the Son of YaH prior to Abraham. In doing so, Yeshua/Jesus clearly broke the

**commandment to not disrespect your parents** (Sh'moot (Ex.) 20:12). Mark 6:3 is another similar example that the people of the community in which Yeshua/Jesus grew up in certainly did not believe he was born of a virgin and was something special. "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mer'yam (Mary), the brother of Y'aiqob (James), and Yusap (Joses/Joseph), and of Yahudah (Juda), and Sh'mon (Simon)? And are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him." And how about John 7:27? "Howbeit we know this man whence he is: but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is" (KJV). Christian teachers and preachers often gloss over these texts as irrelevant, but such texts clearly reveal that there was a consensus in the community Yeshua/Jesus grew up in that he was simply a regular guy, not some miracle child, and likely the child of an illegitimate relationship. **These texts clearly show that Yeshua/Jesus could not admit who he was the child of. He did not refer to his parents or his lineage that Matthew and Luke claimed/recited. He circumvented his earthly origins to claim he was from above and existed prior to coming in the flesh.**

Now that we've dealt with how the Immaculate Conception violates marital Turah (Gen. to Deut.) principles, let's move on to the differences between Matthew and Luke, and the controversial quotations they make from writings prior to the New Testament. According to Luke 2:7 there was a struggle to find a place to give birth as there was "no room at the inn," and he was therefore born in a "manger." The word used is "pat'nay" from the Greek "pateomai" with reference to eating as an animal trough.<sup>3</sup> The idea of course implied is that Yeshua/Jesus was born as a lovely and innocent sheep to be led to the slaughter. Matthew omits these details, but he is consistent with Luke in saying that the birth took place in Bayt'Lakhem (Bethlehem - Matt. 2:1). Luke says that after the birth they went to the "Temple," for the naming of Yeshua/Jesus and cutting his foreskin (circumcision) as per the commandments of the Turah to name and cut the foreskin on the 8<sup>th</sup> day (Lev. 12:3). Matthew mentions nothing of going to do this. Luke says that after presenting Yeshua/Jesus that they went to Natsarat (Nazareth). And it is at this juncture that a major difference takes place. Matthew, skipping the details of the presentation of the child in the "Temple"<sup>4</sup> says that the young couple with baby Yeshua/Jesus went to hide in M'tsrayim (Egypt - Matt. 2:14). No other writer but Matthew mentions how YaHUAH spared His only Son Yeshua/Jesus from certain death by hiding him in M'tsrayim (Egypt) until the death of Herod. Another significant difference is in Luke 2:4 saying that before the birth they went to Natsarat (Nazareth) because of a census for taxation. Matthew doesn't bother to mention a census, and certainly nothing of Natsarat (Nazareth).

A lot of opponents of the New Testament are against the idea that Luke was historically accurate with the idea of a census under Qurinius and the idea that Rome would require people to go to the city of their birth. I've looked into these matters. After thorough study I have found that there are records of censuses that did indeed require people to go to the city of their birth. One example is Gaius Vibius Maximus, the prefect of M'tsrayim (Egypt), who required people to travel to their "place of origin."<sup>5</sup> Therefore

---

<sup>3</sup> See for example the side note to Luke 2:7 in *The Companion Bible*, page 1311.

<sup>4</sup> The first "Temple" in Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) was built by Da'ud (David) over 500 years after the Turah. We who follow only the Turah are looking forward to the Tent/Tabernacle being re-established in Sh'kam (Shechem) instead.

<sup>5</sup> Shelton, Jo-Ann, pp. 143-144.

Luke's statement could be taken as a possible historical truth. The argument of people such as myself against the New Testament is not that there are no historical accuracies in the New Testament. But there are numerous contradictions between New Testament claims which writers make from the TaNaKh (commonly "Old Testament"). The reason I've pointed out the historical accuracy of a census to place of birth is to say that there certainly are invalid arguments against the New Testament. We need to be careful about what we claim as facts and present proper research.

Getting back to where we left off concerning Natsarat (Nazareth), it is **AFTER the birth** Matthew 2:21-23 says they went to Natsarat (Nazareth) of Galil (Galilee), because they were afraid of going to Yahudah (Judea). Luke on the other hand mentions nothing of this. **These are significant omissions on the part of these two accounts.** A lot of debates I have watched and read on the birth and youth of Yeshua/Jesus argue that these are contradictions. **In actual fact they are not contradictions, but they are significant omissions by both writers.** Luke focuses mostly on prior to the birth. Matthew focuses mostly on after the birth. But it is significant to note that there are huge claims in both accounts that are ignored by both writers, and writers apart from Matthew and Luke. It is a big deal that Matthew doesn't mention the census of taxation. It is a big deal that Luke doesn't mention hiding in M'tsrayim (Egypt). It is a big deal that Matthew doesn't mention the lowly birth in a manger or going to Natsarat (Nazareth) prior to the birth, or that he forgot to mention anything of the naming and cutting the foreskin (circumcision) of Yeshua/Jesus. These are important details is because they are pretty much two different stories. People often forget that in the first century CE people wouldn't have had easy access to both stories conveniently in a "New Testament" like people do now.

Now that we've talked about some of the "minor" details of differences between Matthew and Luke, let's get to the heart of the matter. The problem of the New Testament is that the writers always quote the "Old Testament" out of context. I'll give you something simple. Let's imagine I said that in the future someone is going to go to the store. He will buy an apple. He will bring the apple home. We will all eat it. Now in reality let's say that I imagined that this is my son going to the store, buying an apple, bringing it home, and our family eating it. Now someone else far in the future, whom we'll call Bob, comes along and says "Look, there is a man going to the building as it was prophesied! Let us believe in him and follow him!" First of all Bob changed the word "store" to the word "building." Are stores in buildings? Of course. But buildings can be used for numerous things, not just stores. What about the rest of what I said? What about the context of buying the apple and bringing it home to eat it? What about the fact that this was about my son and not some stranger far in the future? Unfortunately, people may follow the stranger and Bob who is following the stranger. And that is the exact problem of the New Testament time and again, through changing the original words and context. Now let's go through the examples in some baby steps.

Matthew 2:23 claims that according to the prophets, that Yeshua/Jesus was foretold to be "a N'tsri." Most translations transliterate this as "Nazarene." But because there is no prophecy about such a thing, numerous commentators have stated that it is the Aibreit (Hebrew) word for "branch" ("n'tsar" in Aibreit - Hebrew). Therefore his followers were "branches" or "N'tsrim" (Nazarenes). Ok. Let's pretend that is what it was, that Yeshua/Jesus was being referred to as the "Branch" and his followers were "branches." The point is, there was no prophecy related to Natsarat (Nazareth) as a city, which Matthew

states is the context for said "prophecy," saying "dwelt in a city called Nazareth" (KJV). As far as Natsarat (Nazareth) being a town or village it was not mentioned at all in ancient literature. It isn't mentioned by Josephus or the Talmud.<sup>6</sup> I won't argue along the lines of Rene Salm or T. Cheyne that **Natsarat (Nazareth)** was uninhabited and/or a cemetery in the time of Yeshua/Jesus. I am not convinced of that although I have studied such claims in depth. But it is important, and no small thing, that it **was an irrelevant city as far as Scripture and historical writings were concerned**. Matthew claiming any reference to Natsarat (Nazareth) in Scriptures prior to the New Testament is a false claim to prophetic fulfilment. It is even recorded in the New Testament as an objection that **"can anything great come out of Natsarat (Nazareth)"** (John 1:46)? If anything, it was **a town of obscurity and by Scriptural standards** had nothing to do with any prophecy as claimed by Matthew. Moreover, if this be a reference to the concept of Yeshua/Jesus being the "Branch" from the lineage of Da'ud (David), as some commentaries and New Testament defenders have claimed, all we need do is read Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 23:1-7. Verse 5 declares that this **"Branch" would be a King/Sovereign ruling in the land...** not a king up in sh'meyim (firmament/heaven). It states that **Yahudah (Judah) and Y'shr'Al (Israel) would be saved and dwell in safety**. Clearly Yeshua/Jesus has not saved the land of Y'shr'Al (Israel) and brought safety. Verse 7 says that the descendants of Y'shr'Al (Israel) would be brought out of all the lands that they were scattered to. Christians often resort to Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 11 as the fulfilment of Yeshua/Jesus being the "branch." Verses 6-8 of that chapter talk about **wolves lying down with lambs**, cows and bears feeding together and lions eating straw. Verse 10 uses the specific phrase **"in that day."** **It is a specific time when the exiled tribes of Y'shr'Al (Israel) are gathered back to the land of promise** (vs. 11-12). Do you see the importance of reading in context? Christian dispensationalism claims that these things will be done in the future when Yeshua/Jesus comes back. Yet they believe he is the Branch NOW, without having any proof of Yeshua/Jesus as fulfilling anything to do with the "branch" "prophecies" of his life in the first century CE. One cannot claim that Yeshua/Jesus is the "branch" when he has not fulfilled any of the specific and grand details attributed to the "branch" in Scriptures prior to the New Testament.

Turning our attention back to Matthew chapter two, he quotes in 2:15 from Hushai (Hosea) 11:1. "Out of M'tsrayim (Egypt) have I called my son." Originally this was simply a text referring back to the Exodus. In fact, **the whole context of Hushai (Hosea) chapters ten and eleven** - which I encourage people to go ahead and read - **is about the people of Y'shr'Al (Israel) being taken into the captivity** of Ashur (Assyrian kingdom). Hushai (Hosea) chapter 13:4 again reiterates a similar statement saying "Yet I am **יְהוָה** (YaHUAH) your Alahym (Mighty One) from the land of M'tsrayim (Egypt), and you will know no mighty one but Me. For there is no Deliverer beside Me." Contrary to Christianity, this statement uses the word "y'shai," meaning "deliverance/Deliverer." **יְהוָה** (YaHUAH) is saying clearly there is no "y'shai" or Yeshua/Jesus beside Him. **To say that Yeshua/Jesus going into hiding is somehow a second or dual fulfilment or in any way related to such texts as Hushai (Hosea) 11:1 is way beyond a small stretch of the imagination.** Tom VanAsperen and numerous New Testament teachers including the writers of the New Testament themselves have built a false bait concept that most people have bitten onto hook, line and sinker. The concept that a prophecy can have more than one fulfilment or application, apart from original context, even changing the original

<sup>6</sup> The Archaeological Study Bible, pg. 1623.

words if the need arises. Having had numerous debates with Christians and pastors over the years, I am shocked that people think it is acceptable to deliberately change the context and words that gave יהוה (YahUAH) His people to create their new "fulfillments" and beliefs. This is plainly evidenced in my recent debate with pastor Matthew Janzen and subsequent discussions on Facebook with him and Sean Griffin of Kingdom in Context. Ironically enough, Sean ignores the context of these same texts that I have pointed out and quoted to him in conversations that took place about "the Branch" as I've written above. I'm not saying that it isn't possible for a prophecy to have a second fulfillment. Yahushai (Joshua) was very much like M'shih (Moses), delivering the people of Y'shr'Al (Israel) into the promised land. In such a comparison there are striking resemblances. The problem is that there are very few things prior to the New Testament foretelling likenesses of what has happened before as happening a second time. In the case of Yeshua/Jesus there are no such grand features of contrast. There is absolutely no relation or likeness to all of the texts which New Testament writers use as parallels to Yeshua/Jesus.

Continuing Matthew chapter two, a major problem exists with the claim that Herod killed children under the age of two in supposed fulfilment of Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 31:15. Matthew says in 2:18 of his writings that "*In Ra'meh (Rama) was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rakhel (Rachel) weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.*" Let's look at Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 31:15 in the context of the two verses that follow after it. "This says יהוה (YahUAH): 'A voice was heard in Ra'meh. Lamentation and bitter weeping. Rakhel (Rachel) weeping for her children, refusing to be comforted for her children, because they are no more.' 16 This says יהוה (YahUAH): 'Refrain your voice from weeping, and your eyes from tears: for your work will be rewarded,' says יהוה (YahUAH). 'And they will come again from the land of the enemy. 17 And there is expectation in your end,' says יהוה (YahUAH), 'that *your children will come again to their own border.*' " The context is clearly a lamentation for the people of Y'shr'Al (Israel) who were being taken captive to B'bayl (Babylon), as it remains to this day. Our family only follows the Turah (Gen. to Deut.), and as such M'shih (Moses) first prophesied this in D'bayrim (Deut.) 28-32. I created a video on YouTube regarding D'bayrim (Deut.) chapter thirty which states the dispersion and regathering of Y'shr'Al (Israel). So we've read where Matthew is quoting from in 2:18 of his writings. Where is the parallel? Matthew is supposedly talking about children being killed by Herod, and the mothers of the children or Rakhel (Rachel) as refusing to be comforted because their children are killed. Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 31:15-17 on the other hand is speaking of people who are not killed, but taken into captivity, and whose descendants would be brought back to the land. The reason *Y'ramYahu (Jeremiah) speaks of the children of Rakhel (Rachel) as being "were not" is a phrase of them being gone into captivity, not that they are killed.* And we're not talking about a few dozen children as in the case of Matthew's text that were supposedly killed. *In the text of Y'ramYahu (Jer.) we're talking about thousands of people* who were thrown out of their land and dispersed among the nations. Whereas *Matthew's text does not provide comfort to the mothers who lost their children, Y'ramYahu (Jer.) on the other hand provides comfort to Rakhel (Rachel) that her children will be coming home again.* This is of course one of the major reasons why people rejected Yeshua/Jesus from the beginning, because he did not lead the people of Y'shr'Al (Israel) back from the lands of exile and captivity.

Matthew's story of killing children under the age of two, using the text of Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 31:15 as a prophetic reference to said event has no contextual basis whatsoever.

**Matthew 27:51-52 claims that the temple veil was rendered in half with a great earthquake** when Yeshua/Jesus died, and that numerous people rose up from the dead at this great event? Such a magnificent event that would have rocked the cradle of the Middle East but yet not a single historical writer wrote about these people that rose from their graves. Tim Chaffey of Creation Today has a book entitled *In Defence of Easter* wrote that Matthew is "the only record we know about."<sup>7</sup> How then can we trust Matthew as a historical writer of facts when he talks about Herod killing of children under the age of two in Matt. 2:16? There are numerous authors like Paul Maier who have made statements questioning the historical character of Matthew and Luke's stories of the childhood of Yeshua/Jesus. In his 1998 book *Herod and the Infants of Bethlehem*, Maier writes that "Most modern biographers of Herod, and probably a majority of Biblical scholars dismiss Matthew's story as an invention."<sup>8</sup> Josephus doesn't mention it, although he wrote of numerous misdeeds and even the murder of three of his sons. Some references or commentaries on Herod killing children under the age of two argue that it wasn't a significant amount of young boys that would have been killed in Bayt'Lakhem (Bethlehem). *The Companion Bible* side notes to Matt. 2:16 claim "The number could not have been great."<sup>9</sup> Modest estimates like the *Archaeological Study Bible* say it was "probably only a few dozen little boys were killed as the result of Herod's irrational fury."<sup>10</sup> People like Matthew Janzen accept as fact what Matthew alone has stated as historical. But Yeshua/Jesus said rightly "If I bear witness of myself, then my witness is not true" (Yahukhenun (John) 5:31). Josephus wrote that Herod, in 4BCE "caught no fewer than forty of the young men, who had the courage to stay behind, when the rest ran away; together with the authors of this bold attempt, Judas and Matthias," and had them killed. We're talking about 40 people who vandalized a golden eagle, burned to death.<sup>11</sup> Surely this was much less significant than eliminating the young M'shiyawkh (Messiah) who was believed to grow to rise up against Rome and deliver Y'shr'Al (Israel), raising up a new kingdom. The *Archaeological Study Bible* admits "the slaughter of the infant and toddler boys of the town by Herod the Great is not attested in other ancient sources."<sup>12</sup> Classical historian Michael Grant wrote "The tale is not history but myth or folklore" in his 1971 book *Herod the Great*.<sup>13</sup> It is no wonder that people in our modern age do not accept the virgin birth story as far as historical credibility is concerned. There isn't one Greco-Roman or "Jewish" historical writer who records such things as the killing of children under Herod as historical fact. I have numerous versions of Scripture, one of which is the *Archaeological Study Bible*. While it contains numerous details and even several articles and appendixes dealing with Herod and Quirinius (governor of Syria), there is no reference of any real historical value pertaining to the virgin birth or killing of children under Herod.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://creationtoday.org/did-the-dead-rise-and-appear-in-jerusalem/>.

<sup>8</sup> Maier, pp. 170-171.

<sup>9</sup> Bullinger, pg. 1311.

<sup>10</sup> *Archaeological Study Bible*, pg. 1487.

<sup>11</sup> From chapter 6 of Josephus' *Antiquities*. <http://penelope.uchicago.edu/josephus/ant-17.html>.

<sup>12</sup> *Archaeological Study Bible*, pg. 1487.

<sup>13</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massacre\\_of\\_the\\_Innocents#cite\\_ref-4](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massacre_of_the_Innocents#cite_ref-4).

Matthew Janzen and a lot of other Christian preachers and writings try to refer to Macrobius as a historian pertaining to the slaughter of children under Herod. Most people don't realize that Macrobius wrote during the late third century CE, and was relying on the basis of New Testament rumours and claims that were made, not actual historical records.

Continuing with **matters pertaining to Herod, we read of three mysterious "wise men"** that apparently visited Yeshua/Jesus. According to Matthew they did not even so much as record their names. The gifts they left were never kept and recorded which they should have been as such items were traditionally passed down from father to son as inheritance/heirlooms. Surely the Catholic Church would have loved to have such relics. Moreover according to the New Testament the three wise men were **supposed to report back to Herod** because he found out that it was a young child to be born (Matt. 2:8). There is no historical record of Herod somehow losing track of three wise men who were going to visit the most important child who would grow to rise up against Herod and overthrow Rome. **Some commentaries suggest that these wise men would have had a fair sized caravan.** **Sounds weird to me that Herod would lose track of them** considering he was known for hunting people down, including his own sons, or the disciples of any well known figure like Judas and Matthias.

In Matthew chapter 2:4 he writes that **Herod actually had a gathering of all the priests and scribes** of Y'shr'Al (Israel) to inquire of them what the "magi" had said, asking them about the birth of this "Christ" or "M'shiyawkh - Messiah." **Yet not one single historical record mentions such a grand meeting.** Luke 1:5 only mentions the "days of Herod" and nothing further of Matthew's fantastical claims. By such mention in passing, Luke understood the historical significance of Herod but chose to ignore all details pertaining to his involvement in the life of Yeshua/Jesus. Instead he talks of a census, a relatively peaceful pregnancy without fear or hiding, and of lowly shepherds. It is important to note that **Matthew doesn't mention the census** or the reason for their journey because of such a census. Matthew does speak about the birth of Yeshua/Jesus so it is interesting that he says **nothing about the messenger (angel) or the shepherds.** Luke however makes no mention of expensive gifts of frankincense and myrrh. In Matthew 2:9-11 a story is made that the wise men followed a star and it stopped over the house where Yeshua/Jesus was born. Luke didn't find these details important enough to write about? Again, these are not "minor" differences.

In numerous places the New Testament gives signs for the "Spirit" being involved, such as tongues of fire upon the disciples' heads at "Pentecost" in Acts 2:3 or the "dove" coming down upon Yeshua/Jesus at his baptism in Matthew 3:16. Yet no sign at all of the Spirit coming down upon Mer'yam (Miriam) which eventually resulted in her to be "found" pregnant or conceive, and no witnesses pertaining to this conception. In Luke's story a messenger (angel) appears to Mer'yam (Mary) to convince her of what is going on and that this miracle baby and virgin birth is from the Creator. Matthew doesn't bother with that though, he focuses on Yusap (Joseph) who was going to divorce her privately, and rightly so since **she was "found" with child** according to the text. **This is HUGE.** Between Matthew and Luke, Matthew is the only writer who thought to give any thought to poor Yusap (Joseph). Matthew 1:18 just says she was "found with child." Then in the next verse it says Joe was going to divorce her privately, when suddenly he had a dream saying not to worry, all is well, she's just pregnant by the "Spirit." But **does anyone ever**

actually think about how big of a deal this was to say that Mer'yam (Mary) was "found" pregnant? I guess Joe just kinda put two and two together and noticed Mer'yam (Mary) had something baking in the oven? According to Matthew poor Joe wasn't informed about how it happened until he had a dream long after the fact. I guess Luke forgot to mention about their early rocky marriage. While Luke leaves out Yusap (Joseph) and his amazing dream which convinced him not to divorce Mer'yam (Mary), Matthew leaves out Mer'yam (Mary) and her amazing visit from the messenger (angel). Again, these are not just "minor" differences.

Now that I've described a lot of the differences between Matthew and Luke, it is easy to see that these completely differing accounts of the pregnancy and birth of Yeshua/Jesus are almost as bad as the apostle Paul's conflicting stories of his conversion to Christianity comparing Acts with Galatians and so forth. I don't know about you, but when I talk about my childhood, my time in university, my marriage, and my journey through Christianity to Messianic Judaism into just finally following YaH and the Torah alone, my story is ALWAYS the same. And I'm 100% certain that my children know it and 30 years down the road or when they have children they'll read what I wrote and told them and get it correct also.

These differences between Matthew and Luke might seem "minor" or like they are simply overlapping by focusing on different parts, but imagine in ancient times receiving the account from Matthew alone and then coming across Luke's account later. In Luke's story the pregnancy period of Mer'yam (Mary) was a glad time without the need for hiding and in fact she casually visits her cousin who is pregnant with Yahukhenun (John) the Baptist. Supposedly this was a very glad occasion celebrating two very special miracle children that Matthew I guess forgot about or didn't deem important enough to talk about. It seems one miracle birth wasn't enough for Luke though so the story of Yahukhenun (John) goes that Alish'bai (Elizabeth), much like Sh'rah (Sarah) and Abraham, was unable to conceive or bear children until the miracle birth of John the Baptist. Luke 1:56 says that Mer'yam (Mary) stayed there for 3 months out of the pregnancy. But then Luke put his foot in his mouth further as a false prophet in Luke 1:67-75. "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, 68 Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, 69 And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; 70 As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: 71 That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; 72 To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; 73 The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, 74 That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, 75 In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life" (Luke 1:67-75, KJV). I don't know but I think New Testament believers must have their head in the clouds. Or clearly they thought that Yeshua/Jesus was actually going to do these things. The reality is that we still live under governments that promote abortion, chemtrail skies, child molestation and all the rest of what is happening. Doesn't sound like freedom from enemies and serving YaH in freedom and prosperity in the land promised to Abraham to me. Last I checked Gaza was still sending over bombs and rockets into the land of Y'shr'Al (Israel). When I quoted this to pastor Matthew Janzen all he had to say was that these were

"spiritually fulfilled" at the "first coming" of Yeshua/Jesus.<sup>14</sup> The problem with this kind of thinking is that Yahukhenun (John) the Baptist was supposedly preparing the way for Yeshua/Jesus for the purpose of accomplishing the things in the text quoted above. Once again, the claim was that through Yeshua/Jesus, יהוה (YaHUAH) had visited and redeemed his people, to save Y'shr'Al (Israel) from their enemies so that they could follow the Turah and serve יהוה (YaHUAH) without fear. The idea of a "second coming" is nowhere in the text. **Deuteronomy 13:1-5 warns us not to listen to false prophets, and was actually punishable by death.** So also **Luke 9:27 Yeshua/Jesus proved himself a false prophet, claiming that some of his followers would not 'taste death until, till they see the kingdom of God'** (KJV). Again, most Christian commentaries claim that they saw this "spiritually" somehow before they died. Funny enough, there are actually some people who believe some of the disciples are actually still alive and walking around somewhere. They'd rather believe that without any proof than come to grips with the fact that they have believed in a false prophet.

Another gritty contradiction is **Matthew 2:6** where Matthew claims that Bayt Lakhem (Bethlehem) was really special because the king of Y'shr'Al (Israel) was supposed to come from there. This was again, an out of context claim taken from **Mikah 5:1**. It's verse 2 in most Bibles, verse 1 in an Aibreit (Hebrew) TaNaKh (OT). "And you, Bayt Lakhem (Bethlehem) Ap'ratah (Ephrathah) you are too small to be among the thousands of Yahudah (Judah), but from you someone will emerge for Me to be a Ruler over Y'shr'Al (Israel)." That's half the verse but you get the point. **Matthew is highlighting again half a verse out of a full chapter** and using it as reference that Yeshua/Jesus is somehow a fulfilment. If you read on **in Mikah chapter 5 you'll find that this Ruler in verse 3 is supposed to lead the children of Y'shr'Al (Israel) out of bondage and exile to the nations just like M'shih (Moses) said would happen in D'bayrim (Deut.) 28-32.** They were supposed to be settled in the land (again verse 3) and peace to the ends or four corners of the nations. Verses 4 and 5 are about the overthrow of Ashur (Assyria), which happened long ago. Verse 8 is the defeat of all the enemies of Y'shr'Al (Israel). Verses 9-10 speak of no more need for chariots or walls to protect the cities. The commentary of Radak says "There will be no need for weapons or defenses, for there will be no more wars."<sup>15</sup> Verse 12 is a direct contradiction to Christianity which states that there will be no more graven images or prostration to such images. The Catholic church continues to defile the land of Y'shr'Al (Israel) in this way. Soooo... clearly Matthew took one verse out of a whole chapter, which the New Testament is notorious for, claiming the Ruler of Bayt Lakhem (Bethlehem) had come and been born. **Annnnd... 2000 years later... Yeshua/Jesus has done nothing in regards to these matters.** Mikah chapter five ends with the statement that YaHUAH will carry out **vengeance upon the nations** (at ha guyim) because they did not listen.

Now let us get to the most critical text where this virgin birth really started. **Matthew 1:23** refers to Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14. This blasphemy is a little more complex. **Matthew 1:23 is actually the second half of a verse from a two chapter prophecy in Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7-8. So what happened to the two chapters?** It's just half a verse that has a dual fulfilment? Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7-8 is contextually about the children of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.), not the children of Mer'yam (Mary) and Yusap (Joseph). In chapter 8, when Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) went in to the prophetess to be intimate with her so she would

<sup>14</sup> See [https://youtu.be/iYSRTUX\\_TmM](https://youtu.be/iYSRTUX_TmM) at the 1:24:15 mark of our debate.

<sup>15</sup> *The Stone Edition Tanach*, pg. 1382.

conceive/become pregnant, he took witnesses who stood near the tent (8:3). In the case of Mer'yam (Mary), there were no witnesses who made sure that Mer'yam (Mary) was a virgin, engaged to her husband, and kept away from men before and during pregnancy. Then after the birth there was no virginity or bridal cloth kept and offered as proof, as was customary by marital standards of Turah. Had such a thing been done, it would've been proclaimed throughout the land. That would've been a miracle proclaimed and believed for sure. But that is not reality. There is no reason to believe that the prophecy of Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) 7 was only partially fulfilled and has a second meaning nowhere included in the text. By ignoring the historical context and application of any given prophetic statements in the "Old Testament" as it is called, New Testament writers can apply texts to their new religion, giving Christians the idea that prophecies have more than one historical or spiritual fulfillment.

There are only three places that we find the name "Aym'nu'Al" (Emmanuel) in the common Bible. The last place being in Matt. 1:23. The other two references to an actual name Aymnu'Al (Immanuel) are in Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) 7:14 and 8:8. However the concept of YaH being "aym'nu" (with us) is found long prior though in the Turah (Gen. to Deut.). In D'bayrim (Deut.) 19:14 (vs. 15 in Bible versions) reference is made to "ha-b'rit" (the-oath) of the Turah which YaHUAH made "aym'nu" (with us) His people. Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14 tells us "Assuredly, my Ruler (Adani) will give you a sign (aut) of His own. Look (haynuh)! **THE** young lady (h'ayl'meh) will become pregnant, and bear a son, and will call his name 'Aym'nu'Al' (the Mighty One (Al) is with us (aymnu))." Yes, the "will become pregnant" is future, but we'll get to that later. The word "look" demands our attention. What was the prophet asking Akhez (Ahaz) to look at? What was he pointing to? The prophet asks us to look at "**THE** young lady" that he is pointing to. The original phrase is "h'ayl'meh," meaning "the young lady." Christian translators changed the "hay" or "the" to "a" young lady. Well then it can refer to any lady! So they had to change the text to shoehorn a virgin maiden into the Yeshua/Jesus story. The other major blunder which Matthew made was to change the text from the mother naming the child (she will call him Aymnu'Al) to "**they** will call his name Aym'nu'Al (Emmanuel)" (1:23). Changing words of the original text of words that are claimed to be from the Most High אֱלֹהֵינוּ (YaHUAH) is a direct violation D'bayrim (Deut.) 4:2.

The next thing that was changed from Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14 was the word "ayl'meh." James Trimm, author of the *Hebraic Roots Version Scriptures* has a footnote on Matthew 1:23 saying "the Aramaic versions of Matthew and Y'shaiYahu both used 'b'tulta' meaning certainly virgin." Matthew Janzen did a sermon on this as well, number 238 on his website. At the 14:20 mark he says "the word almost, if not always means a pure virgin." Janzen clearly shows that he knows "b'tulah" is the proper word for a pure virgin as he quotes from Deuteronomy 22:23 at the 19 minute mark. A lot of people are confused by these two terms so let me make it clear. "Ayl'meh" vs. "b'tulah" is like if we were to say in English a "woman" or a "lady." Woman and lady are both a female mature adult. Context would determine whether woman or lady would be a better word to use. The word "ayl'meh" actually means "young lady." "B'tulah" is very specifically a "virgin." The reason why "ayl'meh" is associated with a "virgin" and translated as such is because generally a "young lady" would be appropriate for marriage as in B'rasheet (Gen.) 24:43. Context is very important of course in determining how to translate a particular word. How do we know that the word "ayl'meh" in Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14 should be

translated as "young lady" and not "virgin?" Because the lady that is spoken of in Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14 is the wife of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.)... and they already had one child at this point named "Sh'ar Y'shub" in 7:3! Not to be funny and tremendously contradictory to the Christian claim, there are even some Christian commentators who affirm that this is correct. As Matthew Henry states regarding Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:3, this is the wife of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.), "His wife (because the wife of a prophet) is called the prophetess; she conceived and bore a son, another son, who must carry a sermon in his name, as the former had done (ch. 7:3), but with this difference, that spoke mercy, Shear-jashub- The remnant shall return; but, that being slighted, this speaks judgment, Maher-shalal-hash-baz- In making speed to the spoil he shall hasten, or he has hastened, to the prey."<sup>16</sup> WOW! Ironically enough, the Matthew Henry famous Christian commentary said something completely contrary to New Testament belief regarding Matthew 1:21-23. Again, the "prophetess" mentioned is actually the wife of Y'shaiYahu whom he already had a child with in 7:3. How then can she be a virgin in 7:14? The first child of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) had a special name, "Sh'ar Y'shub," meaning "a remnant (sh'ar) will turn back (y'shub)." I need to clarify that some translations do not like the future tense of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14 as "will become pregnant." There are some Jewish versions of the TaNaK (OT) which use the future tense, and rightly so. "Therefore, my Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, the maiden will become pregnant and bear a son, and she will name him Immanuel."<sup>17</sup> The reason for this is because the whole point of this prophecy in Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14 was yet future at that time. In Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 8:3 he goes in to the prophetess, his wife, and she then became pregnant.

Our prophecy of Aym'nu'Al begins actually in Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:1. Akhez (Ahaz) was ruling Yahudah (Judah), and two other rulers (kings) had conspired against him. One was Ratsin (Rezin), the ruler of Aram. The other was Payqokh (Pekah), the ruler of Y'shr'Al (Israel). When this conspiracy was being spoken of against him and became known to him, Akhez (Ahaz) became very afraid (vs. 2). So the Most High tells Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) to go and meet with Akhez (Ahaz), and to take his son Sh'ar Y'shub with him (vs. 3). The message Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) is to give is related in verse four, telling Akhez (Ahaz) not to fear the wrath of Ratsin (Rezin) and Payqokh (Pekah). Then in verse seven אֲנִי יְהוָה (YaHUAH) says that their conspiracy will not come to pass. In 65 years, the 10 tribes of the northern division of Y'shr'Al (Israel) known as "Ap'rayim" (Ephraim) will be scattered to the nations (vs. 8), as also stated in Aymoos (Amos) 7:11-17. To confirm what אֲנִי יְהוָה (YaHUAH) is telling Akhez (Ahaz), the Almighty asks in verse eleven if there is anything Akhez (Ahaz) would like for a prophetic sign. Akhez (Ahaz) politely declines. "I will not prove אֲנִי יְהוָה (YaHUAH)" (vs. 12).

Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) then begins the prophecy of Aym'nu'Al (Emmanuel). He addresses the "House of Da'ud" (David) in verse thirteen with a stern rebuke. Then, even though Akhez (Ahaz) did not ask for a prophetic sign that the words of this prophecy regarding Ratsin (Rezin) and Payqokh (Pekah) were true, yet the Most High gives him one anyway! "Assuredly, my Ruler (Adani) will give you a sign (aut) of His own. Look! The young lady will become pregnant, and bear a son, and will call his name Aym'u'Al (Emmanuel).<sup>15</sup> He will eat cream and honey as soon as he knows to hate wickedness and choose righteousness.<sup>16</sup> And before the child will know to hate wrong and choose right,

<sup>16</sup>Taken from Matthew Henry's Whole Bible Commentary, via <http://biblebrowser.com/isaiah/8-3.htm>.

<sup>17</sup> The Stone Edition Tanach, 965.

the land of these two rulers (Ratsin and Payqokh) whom you are afraid of will be deserted." **Oops, I guess Matthew forgot to mention verses 15-16 of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7 when he quoted verse 14 (Matt. 1:21-23).** אֲדָמָה (YaHUAH) speaks once more to Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) in chapter eight, asking him to take a scroll and write on it clearly "M'hayr sh'lal khesh bayz" (vs. 1), meaning "Plunder hastens and Pillage (spoils) speeds up." Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) takes a couple of witnesses with him that he could trust to verify this prophecy and witness of it. He selects Aur'Yah (Uriah) the Kahayn (priest) and ZakarYaH (Zech.) the prophet (vs. 2). The witnesses go with Y'shaiYahu and waited as he went in to be intimate with his wife, "the prophetess, and she became pregnant and gave birth to a son" (vs. 3). The Most High then told Y'shaiYahu to name this child "M'hayr-sh'lal-khesh-bayz,"<sup>4</sup> "For before the child knows how to say 'Abi' (my father) or 'Ami' (my mother), the riches of Da-meshiq (Damascus) and the plunder of Sh'merun (Samaria) will be taken off before the ruler of Ashur (Assyria)." Now how similar is that to Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 7:14? Are you getting the picture yet? The Most High is doing this because they rejoiced in Ratsin (Rezin), ruler of Aram. Therefore the Most High will send the ruler of Ashur (Assyria) after them, as stated in 8:7-8. **And again, we find the phrase Aym'nu'Al (Emmanuel) in Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) 8:8.** Speaking of the power of the ruler of Ashur (Assyria), אֲדָמָה (YaHUAH) says his power will flow over them like water, and "It will pass through Yahudah (Judah), flooding as it passes and reaching up to the neck. And its wingspan will span the full length of your land, oh Aym'nu'Al (Emmanuel)." Ashur (Assyria) was symbolized by the Eagle, much like the United States is today.

אֲדָמָה (YaHUAH) was going to bring judgment very soon. Verses 9-10 assured this. "Destroy, you people, and then be destroyed yourselves. Listen to this, you distant lands of the earth! Gird yourselves, and then be broken! Gird yourselves, and then be smashed!"<sup>10</sup> Devise a conspiracy and it will be nullified. Speak your mind and it will not stand, for the Mighty One (Al) is with us (Aym'nu)!" Then there are words of comfort saying not to fear those who are conspiring, because "<sup>13</sup> אֲדָמָה (YaHUAH), Ruler of Legions (Tsaba'oot), Him you will set-apart. He is your fear and He is your strength."<sup>14</sup> He will be for a set-apart Dwelling (l'Meqdash - Temple), but also for a stone that strikes, and a rock of stumbling for the two houses of Y'shr'Al (Israel); a trap and a snare for the dwellers of Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem)." **We pause here for a moment, to consider how far the New Testament writings have strayed from this text.** The Most High says He is the "Meqdash" or Set-apart Dwelling (Tabernacle originally). **New Testament writers changed this from referring to the Most High, into a reference to Yeshua/Jesus!** Their claim is that the body of Yeshua/Jesus is for a "Meqdash" (Temple)! They claim that his body, like the "temple," was torn down and rebuilt in three days and three nights. In 1 Peter 2:7-8, the writer portrays Yeshua/Jesus as the cornerstone of the Meqdash (Temple), and his followers are stones built on top. What horror. You see, the New Testament writers realized that they made a new religion apart from the most important structure of the whole Turah... the Tabernacle or Tent of YaH. And of course, to make this writing legitimate, the writer of 1 Peter 2:7-8 lifts a few words from Y'shaiYahu (Isaiah) 8:14, claiming that Yeshua/Jesus is a "stumbling stone and rock of offence." **That is blasphemy, to take something that applies to the Most High and apply it to some other person or thing.**

Back to Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 8:14. אֲדָמָה (YaHUAH) finished saying that punishment is coming upon Ratsin (Rezin), via the might of Ashur (Assyria), and of how He will be for

a set-apart Dwelling (Meqdash) for His people. In verse sixteen He asks Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) to seal this teaching to His taught ones. We come to the conclusion of this prophecy in Y'shaiYahu (Isa.) 8:17-18. "I will wait on **אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל** (YaHUAH), who has hidden His face from the House of Yaiqob (Jacob), and my expectation is in Him. <sup>18</sup>Look! **I and the children (wa'ha'y'ladeem) who are given me (ashir n'tan lee) from אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל (YaHUAH) are signs (l'ahtoot) and symbols for Y'shr'Al (Israel); from אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל (YaHUAH) Tsaba'oot (Ruler of Legions), who dwells in Mount Tsiyun (Zion).**" And there you have it. This is referring to the sons of Y'shaiYahu (Isa.). There is never any indication that some Aymnu'Al (Immanuel) will come far off into the future.

Another problem of the New Testament is the lineage of Yeshua/Jesus. Matthew is very clear in stating a lineage that goes by fathers, concluding that Yusap (Joe) was the son of Yaiqob (Jacob) in Matthew 1:16. This lineage traced back to Da'ud (David) in Matthew 1:6. One problem is Matthew's inclusion of Ta'mer (Tamar), Bat'sh'bai (Bathsheba), Ra'kheb (Rahab) and Root (Ruth). We won't dwell on this for too long but it is worthy to note that all of these ladies were people of sexual transgressions (Gen. 38:12-19; Yahushai (Josh.) 2:1; Root (Ruth) 3:1-14 and 2 Sh'mu'Al (Sam.) 11:2-5). Jews for Jesus claim once again that this is proof that Yeshua/Jesus according to the lineage of Matthew, could NOT be M'shiyawkh (Messiah). Christianity again resorts to the "adoption" claim, that Yeshua/Jesus was not of earthly "seed," but rather from the "seed of the woman" or directly from heaven. This again makes no sense to the context of Scripture. There is no separation from the seed of Adawm or lineage of Adawm to a separate lineage. And there is nowhere in Scripture that predicted a Deliverer from heaven or some adopted son.

The problem is in Matthew 1:11 it states that Y'ash'YaH (Josiah) brought forth a son named **Y'kan'YaH (Jeconiah)**. Some translations shorten this name to just "Coniah." **Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 22:30 says Y'kan'YaH (Jeconiah) was cursed, would NOT prosper in his lifetime, and his children wouldn't sit on the throne of Da'ud (David). EVER.** Y'kan'YaH (Jeconiah) was indeed dethroned, taken to prison, but was later released and given a high seat of government in that kingdom. He also had at least seven children who succeeded him (1 Chron. 3:17-19; 2 Kings 25:27-28). In Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 22:24 the Creator **אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל** (YaHUAH) swore an oath by His own Name. " **'As surely as I live,' declares אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל (YaHUAH).**" Verse 30 at the very end says that **none of the children of Y'kan'Yah "will sit on the throne of Da'ud (David).**" New Testament believers would have us believe that **אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל** (YaHUAH) would swear falsely by His own life and Name, which would even be against His own Commandments (Lev. 19:12). *The Companion Bible* commentary by E.W. Bullinger notes concerning Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 22:30 that "Not one of his seven sons (1 Chron. 3:17,18) sat upon his throne."<sup>18</sup> I want to reiterate that this text states that **אֲשִׁירֶנְתָּן לֵעֵל** (YaHUAH) swore that "as He lives" that Y'kan'Yah and his children would not reign on the throne of Da'ud (David). When YaH makes a promise and oath He does not relent or go back on it. *The Archaeological Study Bible* says the grandson of Y'kan'Yah (Jeconiah), that is Zarub'bayl (Zerubabel) "became governor of Judah (see Hag. 1:1), but not king. Zedekiah was a son of Josiah (see Jer. 37:1), not of Jehoiachin, and he and his sons died before Jehoiachin did (see 52:10-11)."

The main argument that Janzen makes in his book on *The Virgin Birth* is that Da'ud (David) was not a literal descendant valid for the throne, but rather adopted. I agree.

<sup>18</sup> Bullinger, E.W. *The Companion Bible*, page 1048.

It is my belief that Da'ud (David) broke every law in D'bayrim (Deut.) 17, and the Davidic kingdom was the downfall of Y'shr'Al (Israel) that led to their dispersion 500 years after the Turah of M'shih (Moses). The point is, Christians believe in a Davidic "Old Testament" and the point of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke is to prove that their Anointed One/Christ/Messiah came from such a lineage. And so if Yeshua/Jesus is "adopted" by Yusap (Joseph), not the literal seed/child, then the genealogy is completely irrelevant. There'd be no need to record it. Now most certainly since it is only the female virgin that is of concern. **יאְהוָה (YaHUAH) need only miraculously impregnate Mer'yam (Mary). There'd be no need for Yusap (Joseph) at all actually. So why wait until Mer'yam (Mary) was already betrothed to someone, cause her to almost be divorced and/or stoned before making her pregnant? According to New Testament professors, preachers and teachers including Jews for Jesus.org website, Yeshua/Jesus was accepted by Yusap (Joseph) "like" a son through adoption. It's evident that Yeshua/Jesus wasn't ACTUALLY the son of Joe because really the seed or "sperma" (Greek) Joe had nothing to do with Yeshua/Jesus, as is clearly stated. So why the need for a vain genealogy? I believe this is why Sha'ul/Paul of Tarsus urged his readers/listeners not to engage in "vain genealogies" in Titus 3:9. The only genealogy Paul could've been concerned with primarily was that of Yeshua/Jesus. And in my honest opinion a genealogy really has no business in the virgin birth and childhood accounts Matthew and Luke wrote about. It's completely irrelevant. The reason that the genealogy of Yeshua/Jesus SHOULD have been important IF he was the M'shiyawkh (Messiah) is because all the promises to the forefathers of the Turah (Gen. to Deut.) pertain to literal sons of the forefathers that **יאְהוָה (YaHUAH)** made promises and oaths with. B'rasheet (Gen.) 12:7 for example spoke about the sons of Abrawm that YaH swore to give the land of Kan'ayn (Canaan) to, the land of Sh'kam (Shechem). **In fact, there isn't a single text in all of the 202 verses of the TaNaKh or commonly "Old Testament" that I have seen where the word "z'rai" (Zera commonly) or "seed" is referred to as something spiritual and not literally the sperm or offspring of an animal or person in Scripture.****

In all my studies on the subject of the genealogy of Yeshua/Jesus I have never heard anyone claim that Yeshua/Jesus literally is the descendant of Da'ud (David). In summary and conclusion Jews for Jesus claimed that Matthew only listed the lineage of Yusap (Joseph) because it was to show "why Yeshua could NOT be king if he really were Joseph's son." Matthew therefore placed his lineage at the beginning before talking about the virgin birth. And further, as believing that Luke's lineage belongs to Mer'yam (Mary), Jews for Jesus stated that Luke's "genealogy shows why Yeshua COULD be king." Their reasoning is that Genesis refers to the "**seed of the woman**" (3:15). Their reasoning is based on B'rasheet (Gen.) 3:15 where YaH speaks to Adawm and Khuah (his wife commonly "Eve") stating that her "seed" and the serpent or snake's "seed" would be at war/enmity. **In context though**, this isn't stating that seed or lineage is reckoned by the mother. In fact there isn't a single example of that prior to the New Testament. It's stating a specific punishment in regards to the children she would bear. However, **that seed clearly started with the children of Adawm (Adam) literally, not a maternal lineage.** No one ever assumed or believed in a lineage of Adawm, and a separate lineage "from the woman," or some prophetic "woman" lineage of the future. You won't find such concepts in Talmudic literature or otherwise. There is never any hint anywhere prior to the New Testament that some guy would come and die, and then run off above the clouds and hide

for 2000 years. **Remember Luke 1:73-75** we quoted earlier? **Yeah, that's a big problem.** **It's clear that Luke understood it referred to the literal seed of Da'ud (David)**, of which Yeshua/Jesus is most certainly not.

### **Dani'Al's (Daniel) 70 Week Prophecy**

Before we get into the Heathen/Pagan Connections to the New Testament "virgin birth" story, I'll deal with this last "prophecy" that Christianity commonly uses. It is common Christian belief that Dani'Al (Daniel) made a 70 week prophecy that somehow points to the time period of the virgin birth and death of Yeshua/Jesus. We could most certainly spend hours researching the statements and possible starting and ending points of this prophecy as it pertains to characters like Karash (Cyrus) or Artaxerxes. In university I had a course taught to me entitled *Daniel and the Revelation*, which tied concepts from Dani'Al (Dan.) to the New Testament scroll/book of Revelation. There are numerous series and sermons by people like John Hagee on this matter, and Matthew Janzen refers to it as well. But I'm going to make this as simple and short and sweet as it really is. Looking at Dani'Al (Dan.) 9:24 in this timeline period, a character will "finish the transgression," "end transgressions," "anoint the second compartment of the M'qdash (House/Temple)," and bring in "everlasting righteousness." It doesn't say that someone will die, then 40 years later the animal offerings will be stopped by the destruction of the Temple of Da'ud (David), and that 2000 years later there will be everlasting righteousness. Moreover, **the idea of ending transgressions prior to the New Testament was always understood to be exactly that... the ACTUAL END of transgression.** Period. No buts or somehow "spiritually" ending transgressions. **"Everlasting righteousness" prior to the New Testament was always understood as exactly that as well.** No wrongfulness and transgressions being committed any longer. Rather, only right-doing and obedience to the laws and commands of **יְהוָה (YaHUAH)**. It actually meant to end transgressions against the Turah. Verse 25 says he will build the "street of gold" and the end was supposed to be with a "flood" and a great "battle." I remember my teacher in university was actually puzzled by this and admitted that there never was a great "flood" in 70CE, and certainly no great "battle." Yeshua/Jesus did not end transgressions or anoint the second compartment, the innermost place of the M'qdash (House/Temple) as the **animal offerings continued up until 70CE**. He did not bring in everlasting righteousness and we still live in a wicked generation worse than ever. It is in the "midst of the week" (9:27) that the daily offerings were to be discontinued. If this is somehow supposed to be metaphorical, as numerous New Testament writers and scholars try, then let's say 0CE is the beginning. And in fact, a lot of New Testament scholars and teachers agree and believe that. Yeshua/Jesus died about 35CE. The Temple was destroyed in 70CE. If Yeshua/Jesus supposedly ended offerings in the middle of the week, or middle of 0-70CE then why were there still animal offerings from 35-70CE? Why was Paul still supporting animal offerings in Acts 21:26? The point is, as seen above, it takes very little in terms of reading texts like Dani'Al (Dan.) 70 weeks to see that there is no correlation to Yeshua/Jesus. But I must conclude this section to say that Deuteronomy 33:2

### **The Pagan/Heathen Connection**

The pagan/heathen connection between the New Testament virgin birth story and myths prior to it is common knowledge to a lot of New Testament believers and scholars. Christian teachers like Walter Veith of Amazing Discoveries would have us believe, and I quote, "The devil had the messiah prepared before the real one so that people would not accept real one." That's from the 16 minute and 29 second mark of YouTube video on *The Wine of Babylon and the Catholic Church*.<sup>19</sup> WOW! I find it amazing that people are so easily duped into believing that the New Testament, although stealing concepts 1000s of years older from ancient cultures, is somehow the truth paralleling counterfeit "devilish" frontrunners. Janzen shows that, like Walter Veith, he is also aware of myths prior to the New Testament. ***It's not the like pagan virgin births. You mark em all down, you study em all out***, whether its Egyptian, Greek or whatever, all pagan virgin births has a god that comes down in another form and actually be intimate with a woman and produce a hybrid offspring. **Bingo. Hybrid, offspring.** You can try to fudge this but this is exactly what we're talking about in terms of Christianity, a hybrid offspring. Everyone admits that Yeshua/Jesus according to the New Testament had nothing to do with the seed or lineage of Yusap/Joseph, excepting by some "adoption." Janzen admits he's aware of these concepts at least in Egyptian and Greek. I wish I could ask Janzen's congregation if they took his advice. Have you ever actually looked at ancient religions, their original stories from archaeology and manuscripts that actually started them? A lot of the information presented by Walter Veith, based off of earlier books written by Alexander Hislop and Protestantism are not accurate to the facts of history and archaeology. For example Krishna is the 8<sup>th</sup> son of Devaki. "In the story of Krishna the deity is the agent of conception and also the offspring. Because of his sympathy for the earth, the divine Vishnu himself descended into the womb of Devaki and was born as her son, Vaasudeva (i.e., Krishna)."<sup>20</sup> No virgin birth there. **The reason a lot of people talk about "virgin births" before Yeshua/Jesus is because these birth myths did not involve sexual intimacy, but rather miracle pregnancies such as Krishna.** I would say the most puzzling thing about Janzen's statement is that he doesn't provide any examples of proper historical study of these myths and understanding of them. ***The idea of a female virgin somehow becoming pregnant without any form of sexual intercourse with her male counterpart is absurd and belongs in the realm of myth, legend and fantasy.*** The story of Krishna is actually a rare exception, and as stated above, his mother was not a virgin. And so it is, that not even the pagans were false or dumb enough to create an idea of some virgin bearing a hybrid offspring.

**The following are actual facts of religions prior to Christianity:**

1. The original Trinity of M'tsrayim (Egypt) is Osirus (Father), Isis (Mother), and Horus (son). A lot of people think Set was the son figure but he comes later. Veith couldn't even get this right as he stated in *The Wine of Babylon and the Catholic Church* at the 17 min 48 second mark that Osirus is the son of Isis. Osirus is the Father figure, sorry.
2. Ninus is the actual figure who relates to the mother figure Semiramus in terms of myths of B'bayl (Babylon). It is common for people based on Alexander Hislop's

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h8yZNMmIXKE&t=1068s>.

<sup>20</sup> <https://dharma.wikia.org/wiki/Krishna>.

writings and Veith to relate Nimrod to Ninus but that's not anywhere near any historical or archaeological fact. In any case Semiramus does bear a hybrid or special son.

I found that according to Akkadian, Mesopotamian and Phoenician records, that rather there was a sexual relationship/marriage, as well as in the case of Tammuz and Inanna or Astarte and Dionysus. Numerous sources assert that real historical figures were actually behind the figures of Tammuz and etcetera. Christianity simply took the idea of a dead figure suffering and being exalted much like the religions before it. Ba'ayl (Baal), Yam and Mot.

3. The virgin birth is sort of related to myths like Osiris, in that it was based on agricultural myth. Agriculture of course was a large part of ancient living, downplayed and ignored by much of our modern society. James Frazer studied and wrote in the early 19th century about the myths of "dying a rising gods" understanding these historical settings and archaeological research.

4. The story of the conception of Isis is an interesting parallel to the concept of a miraculous conception like the virgin birth of the New Testament. In the story of Isis, she became pregnant by hovering over her dead husband Osiris.<sup>21</sup>

5. An Assyrian story known as the *Epic of Tikulti-Ninurta* from Mesopotamian literature of the Bronze Age is very similar to the story of Christianity. Tikulti-Ninurta is like a vessel or agent of the false mighty ones (gods) of Ashur (Assyria). Out of all the stories I have examined, this story is most like the story/myth the New Testament presents. There are several books written about this Assyrian myth. The Epic of Tikulti-Ninurta claims "he was successfully engendered through/cast into the channel of the womb of the gods. He alone is the eternal image of Enlil." Taken from chapter 1:10-18. He is thought of as being like a molten metal poured out, much like the idols YaH warned us to stay away from. He was heralded as "divine," and the "flesh of the gods," as in the *Erra Epic*.<sup>22</sup> The reference to being the "flesh of the gods" is very similar to John 1:14, claiming that the Word dwelt amongst us in the flesh.

6. The idea of the "sacred womb" was a pagan/heathen myth nowhere found in the TaNaKh (OT) but definitely set the foundation for the New Testament virgin birth myth. Characters from the time of Mesopotamia such as Ugaritic Lady Asherah, Nanna the "begetter of gods and men," Mami the "Mother Womb" and etcetera are all easy to find in any library or on the internet.

**In every case the theme is a special hybrid child and a miracle pregnancy. Not even the pagans stooped to the level of claiming a virgin birth.** That belongs to Christianity. So go ahead, take up the Matthew Janzen challenge. Study the history and archaeology of the myths prior to Christianity. You'll find that there were at least a few "miraculous births" that didn't involve sexuality prior to the New Testament, despite claims that this was unique to the New Testament. The above points are but a small sampling of references and studies I have done into religions and myths prior to Christianity. Even from this small sampling, one can easily see that the foundation for the myth of the "God-man" of the New Testament was laid long prior in the idolatry of Mesopotamia which **𐎶𐎵𐎲𐎠𐎧** (YaHUAH) warned us to avoid. It is my prayer that people will return to **𐎶𐎵𐎲𐎠𐎧** (YaHUAH) and to His Turah (Gen. to Deut.).

<sup>21</sup> <https://ancientegyptonline.co.uk/isis/>.

<sup>22</sup> Herring, pp. 38-43.

## Sources

- Bullinger, E.W. *The Companion Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1922.
- Grant, Michael. *Herod the Great*. MI: American Heritage Press, 1971.
- Herring, Stephen. *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Bristol, CT: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2013.
- Maier, Paul. *Herod and the Infants of Bethlehem*. Mercer University Press, 1998.
- NIV *Archaeological Study Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation, 2005.
- Scherman, Nosson, et al. *The Stone Edition Tanach*. Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah Publications, Ltd, 1996.
- Shelton, Jo-Ann. *As the Romans Did: A Sourcebook in Roman Social History* – 2nd edition – Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Trimm, James Scott. *The Hebraic-Roots Version Scriptures*. Northriding, South Africa: Institute for Scripture Research, 2004.
- <https://ancientegyptonline.co.uk/isis/>
- <http://biblebrowser.com/isaiah/8-3.htm>
- <https://creationtoday.org/did-the-dead-rise-and-appear-in-jerusalem/>
- <https://dharma.wikia.org/wiki/Krishna>
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massacre\\_of\\_the\\_Innocents#cite\\_ref-4](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massacre_of_the_Innocents#cite_ref-4)
- <http://penelope.uchicago.edu/josephus/ant-17.html>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h8yZNMmlXKE&t=1068s>